



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

space), we assure him that we greatly regret the tone into which he has allowed himself to descend, and that, if instead of lightly imputing dishonesty to others, he had been more candid and scrupulous in his own manner of carrying on the controversy, we should have rejoiced in discussing with him to the uttermost a matter of such moment to the world as whether there is or is not a living judge of controversies, to whom, by Divine institution, it is the duty and privilege of all Christians to submit.]

ON THE NAME OF ST. PETER IN THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—In your last number, under the heading of "The See of St. Peter," in answer to Dr. Geraghty, when showing that Matt. x. 2 conferred no supremacy on Peter, from the fact of his name being mentioned first, you mentioned two passages (John i. 44, and Gal. ii. 9) where his name is not mentioned first, but second in one, and last in the other. Your Roman Catholic readers (and I am glad to say there are many such) might possibly think there are no other passages in the Word of God, except these two, where Peter's name is not mentioned first.

Father Keenan, in his *Controversial Catechism*, takes the same line of argument in common with Dr. Geraghty. At page 105 of his catechism the question is asked, "Have you any other scriptural proof of Peter's supremacy?" Answer—"Where the Scriptures give the names of the Apostles in order, Peter's name is always placed first." I venture, therefore, to mention a few places where Peter's name is actually mentioned last. St. Paul, writing to the Corinthian Church, and exhorting them to unity, says, "Now, this I say, that every one of you saith I am of Apollo, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ."—1 Cor. i. 12, Roman Catholic Bible. Now, here Peter is placed after Apollo, and, according to the inference of the Church of Rome, because Apollo is placed before Peter, therefore he should have a primacy over Peter. Again, "For all things are yours, whether it be Paul, or Apollo, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; for all are yours."—1 Cor. iii. 22, Roman Catholic Bible. Here, as will be seen, Cephas, or Peter, which is the same (see John i. 42), is mentioned really last of three. And again, "Have we not power to carry about a woman, a sister, as well as the rest of the Apostles, and the brethren of the Lord and Cephas" (i.e., Peter).—1 Cor. ix. 5, Roman Catholic Bible. So that in three different places in one Epistle Peter is named last. What becomes now of the boast of "his name always being placed first." Here we see all the Apostles are placed before him, and not only that, but the brethren of the Lord also. Now, on referring to Matt. xiii. 56, we find that the brethren of the Lord are "James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Jude."—Roman Catholic Bible. So that all the Apostles, and James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Jude, are here mentioned before Peter.

I would also wish to notice that the last time where the Virgin Mary is mentioned by name she is placed not first, but last of the Apostles and of the other women. "And when they were come in they went up into an upper room, where abode Peter and John, James and Andrew, Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew, James of Alphaeus, and Simon Zelotes, and Jude, the brother of James. All these were persevering with one mind in prayer, with the women, and Mary the mother, and with the brethren."—Acts i. 13, 14, Roman Catholic Bible.

Now, our Roman Catholic friends will argue that because Peter is named first in one or two places, therefore there is a supremacy conferred on him: here the Virgin Mary is mentioned last, and they never infer that no peculiar honour is conferred on her therefore. Hoping, sir, I have not trespassed too much on your valuable space, I remain, sir, yours, &c., T. M.

CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION IN GWEEDORE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

YOUR HONOUR,—There is a deal of talk hereabouts in Gweedore and Cloughaneely these times. We knew a good deal before that was cruel hard on us to know, but sure the newspapers does tell us a deal more now than we all knew before; and when half a dozen of us gets over a newspaper that tells us all that's saying in Parliament about us, and that gets us bits of truth that we didn't know before, it sets us talking of a deal of things.

I spent last night with a boy that got the loan of a paper, and the neighbours had gathered in to hear it, and we come on the evidence of Mr. Cruise, the resident magistrate. Now, we have all mostly a cut of land, and a horse or two, and some cows and sheep, and the sheep tax, for all the sheep that has been killed on the mountains that the Scotchmen rented, and the polis tax, for the polis that was quartered on us, because of the sheep killing, come cruel hard on us; and we are not in the best of good humour with sheep, and shepherds, and polis, and taxes; but nobody can say but Mr. Cruise is a fair man in the duty he has to do, and a good Catholic that minds his duty, and that can't be said against, and that wouldn't say anything bad of his clergy. Well, when we come on his evidence it gave us a deal of talk about the clergy, and whether it wouldn't be best in the long run for the people if the clergy would keep to their own duties. I will tell your honour the way we come about it. First, Ned M'Ginty (that's the boy that got

the loan of the newspaper) read out Mr. Cruise's evidence, and then we just fell to to have some talk about it.

And says Pat Connell, "What business had a Catholic to be speaking against the priests? Wasn't it clean against his religion?"

And says George Cooney, "How could it be against any man's religion to tell the truth? Sure," says he, "it's against religion to tell lies, but how would it be against religion to tell the truth?"

And Pat Connell held out that it was flat against the Catholic religion to tell truth against a priest; and he offered to leave that to the priest himself, and to up and ask him in chapel on Sunday next, the minute he had done the holy mass.

Well, none of the boys was for that; for they allowed that maybe the priest might speak too strong for himself, and so we would just have the talk about that to ourselves.

Then Jemmy M'Bride allowed that it was a sin for a Catholic to say what was bad of a priest, even if it was true.

Then says Ned M'Ginty, "That won't come against Mr. Cruise anyway; for see the way he spoke of Rev. Mr. Mulrenny when he was asked, and he up and said, 'Dr. Mulrenny is a most respectable gentleman, and worthy of every credit.'"

"Ah, bother to you," says Jem M'Fadden; "what else durst he say of a priest, let him think what he would."

And with that all the boys allowed that Mr. Cruise said it because he thought it.

"Signs by, then," says Ned M'Ginty, "Mr. Cruise isn't sharp enough yet to know what a respectable priest that is worthy of every credit will say of him behind his back." And with that Ned M'Ginty reads out to us how Mr. Maguire read in Parliament the Rev. Mr. Mulrenny's letter to the Rev. Mr. M'Roarty, saying that Mr. Cruise told him it was the Scotch shepherds themselves that killed the sheep, and how Mr. Maguire asked Mr. Cruise if that statement was true, and how Mr. Cruise spoke up and said, "It is false; I never said that, so help me God. My belief was, and is, directly the opposite."

"And who was the liar then?" says one of the boys.

"Oh, whisht," says I; "don't let us get into talking that way about our clergy."

"Well," says Ned M'Ginty, "anyway, mayn't I ask was Mr. Cruise telling lies or truth then when he said 'so help me God,' and him on his oath?"

Well, with that all the boys allowed that Mr. Cruise was surely telling truth; and so we didn't say another word, good or bad, about that. But isn't it the poor thing for Catholics to have to put things off that way, about whether our priests tells truth.

"And, then," says Ned M'Ginty, "sure there's Mr. Hamilton, the poor law inspector, that said he never asked one of us about the destitution, because he knew not one of us would tell him one word of truth."

"And says another boy, whose name I don't like to tell, for fear it would hurt him) how would we tell a word of truth with the teaching we get."

Your honour, that come hard on me, and none of us cared to say more about that. But, sure, to tell truth is more like the true religion than to tell lies.

Only one thing was said more about that; for says Pat Connell, "Well, it's little truth the gentlemen got anyway that came to see the destitution in Gweedore; such hunting of cattle, and hiding of praties and bed-clothes—it was the biggest take in that ever was."

And with that all the boys laughed out, thinking how the gentlemen was done.

"And wasn't the seaweed the best of all," says Ned M'Ginty. "Sure, what did any of us eat, only the sloake and the dilisk; and who wouldn't eat that if he could get it? What boy or girl would be in a fair and not get a ha'porth of dilisk? And doesn't my old aunt, Kitty M'Ginty, get a good living by carrying sloake through the county to sell to the quality; and doesn't the Bishop himself always buy it off her in Letterkenny?" And with that all the boys laughed again, till their sides were sore.

And then we come on how Mr. Cruise told how a witness swore in his informations "that the Rev. Mr. Dogherty had fined parties ten shillings each for sending cattle to graze on Mr. Nixon's land, and paying that gentleman for grazing," and how one of them said "that the Rev. Mr. Dogherty had said that he would not hear him his confession if he sent cattle to graze on Mr. Nixon's land;" and how "they said they would rent the land at thirty shillings, the sum which Mr. Nixon was willing to let it for, but that Mr. Dogherty would not allow them to do so, as he said it would be contrary to the principles of the Tenant League for men to pay more than a pound for it."

Now, your honour, we knew all that; but we fell to to discuss whether a priest had a right to stop men making their own bargains about grazing. And all the boys allowed that every man has a right to make his own bargain for grazing. And we allowed it was a good bargain for the people at thirty shillings, else why would they take it? And we allowed it was no sin to take the grazing; and we allowed that if the priest would not hear our confessions, because we took grazing without his leave, it would be neither more nor less than the priest refusing to let us save our souls according to his religion, just that he might get power over us that he had no right to.

"But, then (says Pat Connell), sure the bishop set all that right when he came down, and took away Mr. Dogherty; and so our souls is right enough while the bishop is over the priest."

"And would you have got that justice for your souls (says Ned M'Ginty) if it wasn't for the police magistrate, that the government pays, that took it up? Sure it's him you are to thank (says he); for how would we have got it but for him?"

So the boys allowed that was true; and isn't it the hard thing that a priest can stop us of what he says is necessary to the salvation of our souls, until we let him settle our grazing for us?

And then we come on the fines that the priest took off them that took the grazing without his leave. "And I wonder (says Ned M'Ginty) where did them fines go to?"

"Where would they go to (says one of the boys) but where the priest's dues goes?"

Well, none of us could tell where else; but we allowed it was no part of the Catholic religion that the priest should lift money that he had no right to; and that we wouldn't stand it.

"But how will you help it (says Pat Connell)? Sure you can't save your souls without the priest; and if the priest won't save your soul till you give up the grazing and pay the fine, how can ye help it?"

"Didn't I tell you before (said Ned M'Ginty) that you would never get that justice for your souls only the police magistrate took it up? And isn't there a deal more that isn't took up, and that just makes slaves of us?"

"Well, any way, it was set right when the bishop come down and took away Mr. Dogherty (said Pat Connell). Sure that was a lesson for the priests, any way."

"None of your nonsense, Pat (said Ned M'Ginty); doesn't Mr. Cruise say that the bishop said he would remove Mr. Dogherty to a better parish; and isn't that a nice lesson to give on a priest that denies us the salvation of our souls that he may tyrannize over us, and levy fines off us? And will any man think, after that, that the bishop thought it very bad, or that other priests will be afraid to do the like, when they get promotion by it?"

Well, no one had anything to say against that. So we came to talk of what the bishop said about absolution for them that destroyed the sheep; sure he said "that they had destroyed a number of sheep ever since he came into the district, and that if any one had told them that any priest or bishop could absolve them from such sins, such person stated what was false, and that of Almighty had never delegated such a power to any one, and they could never receive absolution till they had made restitution to the last farthing for all the sheep they had destroyed."

And then we allowed that if all the priests had been preaching this at first, instead of refusing confession to them that took grazing, there would have been no trouble in Gweedore, and no sheep tax, and no polis tax, and no quarrels with landlords that has done us good.

But one thing bothered us entirely about absolution for killing the sheep. "For," says Ned M'Ginty, "I wonder will it do for absolution when the sheep is paid for by the sheep tax that is levied off all the farmers that has land in the barony? Will the fellows that killed the sheep be entitled to absolution because other people that didn't kill the sheep had to pay for them? or will the people that killed the sheep have to pay for them over again? And wouldn't that be the great thing for the Scotchmen to get paid for their sheep twice over? But how would it be with us at all if that come about? Why, there isn't a Scotchman that wouldn't be farming in Ireland then, and paying double rent for double profit; and what would the Gweedore men do then for their cuts of land? They say them Scotch is mighty cute. Well, we were thinking would we go to the bishop about that, when Pat Connell bids us be easy, for them that killed the sheep will get their absolution easy enough, and no questions asked. It won't be like as if they took grazing without the Rev. Mr. Dogherty's leave. So we quit thinking of that any more."

Now, your honour, what I want to know most is this, would there be any way of securing us from the priests meddling in our farming business by denying us the rights of our Church? Could it any way be made a law that the priests should give us what we have a right to for our souls, without taking off us money and grazing that they have no right to.

I'm afraid of my life to put my name to this, so I am at your honour's service,

A GWEEDORE MAN.

[We must say, in answer to our correspondent, that we see no possible means by which those who remain under spiritual despotism can be secured from temporal despotism. Pat Connell's argument on this subject appears to us conclusive. If people will believe that the salvation of their souls depends on the caprice of a priest, in hearing or not hearing their confession, no earthly power can secure them from the danger of being tyrannized over by that priest in their domestic affairs and their worldly business.]